DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 282 641   PS 016 610

AUTHOR   Krappmann, Lothar; Oswald, Hans
TITLE   Negotiation Strategies in Peer Conflicts: A Follow-up
                Study in Natural Settings.
PUB DATE   Apr 87
NOTE   37p.; Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the
                Society for Research in Child Development (Baltimore,
                MD, April 23-26, 1987).
PUB TYPE   Reports - Research/Technical (143) --
                Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   *Age Differences; *Conflict; *Elementary School
                Students; Followup Studies; Friendship; Intermediate
                Grades; *Interpersonal Competence; *Peer
                Relationship
IDENTIFIERS   *Negotiation Processes

ABSTRACT
                To identify the repertoire and the selection of
negotiation strategies of children in natural settings, the
interactions of 34 elementary school students in classrooms and
playgrounds were recorded by two observers who focused on each child
for about 3 hours. Children observed and interviewed were in grades 4
and 6 and approximately 10 and 12 years of age, respectively. An
interaction was deemed a "negotiation" if conflict emerged between at
least two children and led to a controversy actively carried on by
dissenting parties. More than 200 interactions in each age group were
categorized as negotiations. Domains of negotiations were found to be
distinguishable by the negotiability of the problem at issue.
Negotiation strategies differed with regard to the kind of
communication, display of emotions, means used to influence the
other's behavior, and style. A negotiation strategy's potential for
creating an "ideal" situation in which participants could reasonably
exchange views depended on which pattern it followed. The three
patterns were those of coercion and manipulation, offer and reply,
and reasoning. Pattern use varied by age, with the pattern of
reasoning seldom observed at either age. Children differed according
to their participation, repertoire, and the patterns of strategies
they applied. They did not always select strategies fitting the
domain of negotiation. Friends tended to use strategies differing
from those used by non-friends. (RH)

NEGOTIATION STRATEGIES IN PEER CONFLICTS:

A FOLLOW-UP STUDY IN NATURAL SETTINGS

by

Lothar Krappmann and Hans Oswald

Max Planck Institute
for Human Development and Education
Lentzeallee 94
D-1000 Berlin 33
Federal Republic of Germany

Free University of Berlin
Arnimallee 11
D-1000 Berlin 33
Federal Republic of Germany

30.3.1987

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED282641

PS 016610

ERIC

Negotiation strategies in peer conflicts:
A follow-up study in natural settings
by
Lothar Krappmann and Hans Oswald

1. Problem

In the core of children's interactions among themselves is ne-
gotiation. This is implied in Piaget's well known statement
that the structure of social interactions among peers differs
from the structure of interactions between adult and child.
While the child subordinates himself or herself from love or
fear to the expectations of the parents the interactions be-
tween child and child are less dominated from one side and,
therefore, more open to the perspectives of both partners who
both ask for consideration (J. Piaget 1923). At least, the idea
of equality is a regulatory principle to which children adhere
(J. Youniss 1980), although the social reality of children's
interaction often contradicts these desires for respectful
treatment. Again and again vigorous or manipulating children
try to use the others for their own ends only. However, chil-
dren can keep away from these unfair peers and look for others
who are willing to regard their point of view and their sugges-
tions. During middle childhood children increasingly partici-
pate in peer activities in which it is up to them to find out
what is liked by whom and whose proposals are accepted. In or-
der to safeguard the continuation of children's social inter-
actions again and again the differences of views and intentions
have to be negotiated.

Numerous studies have demonstrated that the exchange of opin-
ions and arguments between children promotes their social de-
velopment (J. Smollar/J. Youniss 1982), their cognitive compe-
tencies (W. Doise 1985; G. Mugny et al. 1984), their moral
judgement (W. Damon/M. Killen 1982; T. J. Berndt 1984), and
their maturity of resolving social issues (J. Nelson/

3

F. E. Aboud 1985), even if none of the partners possesses the correct answer or the adequate capacity in advance (M. Glachan/P. Light 1982). Usually, the data of these studies are analyzed with regard of the differences in developmental progress associated with peers' joint efforts to solve a problem as opposed to the effects of adult interventions into the problem solving process. Only in a few studies data were collected in order to investigate the behavioral devices by which the children achieve correct results or improved competencies.

Above all studies concerned with the promotion of moral behavior analyzed the communication processes in which higher level solutions are worked out by the discussants. In these studies a variety of argumentation features in sociomoral discussions was identified which provide for different patterns of dealing with incompatible reasoning. Several developmental models placing these communicative and interactional behaviors in a hierarchical order were proposed (M. W. Berkowitz/J. C. Gibbs 1983; M. Berkowitz/F. Oser/W. Althof, in press; M. Miller 1984; F. Oser 1981). Also S. Powers (1982) distinguished a number of behaviors applied in argumentations. Not all of them represent steps to a constructive solution of the problem under discussion as for instance "distracting" or "devalue/hostility". R. L. Selman/A. P. Demorest (1984) opposed self- and other-transforming negotiation strategies which are ordered on four stages beginning with physical dominance and submission and leading to cooperatively elaborated solutions reflecting the interests of both parties. This developmental model relies on Selman's concept of a stage by stage progressing coordination of children's differing perspectives (R. L. Selman 1980), while the model of M. Keller/S. Reuss (1985) refers to an idealized sociomoral discourse in order to assess levels of reasoning and of strategies when children attempt to solve a friendship dilemma.

According to many studies, negotiation strategies applied by children are connected with their sociometric status and their

integration into peer relationships. The association is best
confirmed for higher rates of physical aggression demonstrated
by children who are disliked (K. A. Dodge 1983). Popular chil-
dren from grade 3 through 7 achieved higher scores on compro-
mising skills than less liked children: however, neglected
children showed relatively higher scores in their answer to a
conflict story than rejected and average children
(L. A. Kurdek/R. Lillie 1985). Highly appreciated children from
grade 1 and 2 engage less in conflicts than other children. The
conflicts in which they participate tend to be more frequently
conflicts about interpersonal influence and more seldom object
related conflicts (C. U. Shantz/D. W. Shantz 1985). Older chil-
dren and children with high sociometric status take into ac-
count the maintenance of a good relationship when confronted
with a hypothetical interpersonal problem (P. D. Renshaw/
S. T. Asher 1983). J. Nelson and F. E. Aboud (1985) found that
in a dispute especially friends influence each other in a way
leading to a more mature solution of a social issue.

We conclude from these investigations that children in con-
flicts use different behavioral procedures in order to solve or
put an end to controversies either in agreement or in dissent.
We conceive of these behavioral procedures as negotiation
strategies. By the concept of a strategy we want to stress the
goal oriented nature of these behaviors. They aim at a state of
settlement which benefits the user of the strategy or both ne-
gotiators. The reported results suggest further research about
the factors connected with the selection of different strat-
egies by negotiating children, since the performance of a
strategy does not depend alone on the achieved level of dis-
course competencies or of sociocognitive coordination of per-
spectives. We suppose (1) that children apply strategies of
different qualities (2) with regard to the domain of negotia-
tion, especially to the normative frame of the controversial
topic. We further suppose, that (3) the domain of negotiation
and the quality of the strategy are related to the outcome of
the negotiation. Finally, we assume that the manifestation of

domains of negotiation, of the strategies applied by the children and of the solutions achieved by the negotiation, and the associations between these variables vary (4) across gender and (5) age and are (6) influenced by the quality of the social relationship existing between the negotiating children.

For the purpose of this presentation the qualities of the two first steps of a negotiation and their connection to domain and solutions are analyzed. This was decided in favor of better comparability since about a quarter of the negotiations was solved or ended after the first reaction of the addressed child. Beyond this pragmatic perspective it was observed that in most negotiations the "definition of the situation" (W. I. Thomas) is persistently determined by initiation and reply, and, therefore, these first steps warrant special attention.

2. Method

Non-standardized observations of children's negotiations in natural settings were regarded as the most appropriate procedur for collecting data which should contain a rich variety of strategies applied by friends and non-friends dealing in an unrestricted manner with problems differing by domain and normative frame. The data are part of a combined cross-sectional and longitudinal study of children's peer interactions from the ages of 6 to 12 conducted in an inner city elementary school. Here we report on the analyses of peer negotiations observed during two periods of data collection in one classroom. Thirty-four children, 18 girls and 16 boys, attended the classroom during the first period of observations on grade 4 (average age 9; 10), 31 children, 20 girls and 11 boys, during the second period on grade 6 (average age 11; 10). Six children of grade 4 left the classroom before the follow-up study on grade 6, and 3 children were observed only on grade 6.

Interactions of children were observed mainly within the rooms of the class, but also during breaks, on playgrounds, and at sports events or excursions. Usually two observers focused during a predetermined time on two children sitting next to each other. The observers exchanged places for another term of observation. Hence, the field notes written down in the situation and elaborated immediatly after the actual observation mostly report the same interactions from two different perspectives and, thereby, make possible mutual complement and control. Following the methods of data collection established in the symbolic-interactionist tradition (B. G. Glaser/ A. L. Strauss 1967) no prefixed coding scheme was used. The observers had to write down each observed interaction sequence and its concomitant circumstances as completely as possible. During the second observation period the conversations of the focal children were tape recorded as well.

The observations continued for some months until the field notes covered at least three hours of observation for each child. Our efforts to provide for an equal temporal amount of observations were not successful in consequence of the normal unsteadiness of classroom life. The observers often talked with the children who sometimes gave additional information about i.ssues and behaviors. After the end of each observation period semi-structured interviews were conducted with all children (one refusal on grade 6) investigating the children's friendships, their joint activities, and their experiences with conflicts and endeavors to solve them.

The aims of the study were explained to the children in detail. The observers assured the children not to "tell tales" to teachers or parents and strictly kept to the promise. Other experts of the social life of elementary school children in Germany confirmed that the recorded behaviors look to be typical and uninhibited.

All negotiations among children were selected from the file
containing all observed interaction sequences in order to form
a subfile "Negotiation" being at disposal for qualitative anal-
yses supported by the software package QUALITAS (K. U. Süß
1987). An interaction sequence was categorized as a "negoti-
ation" if a dissent emerged between at least two children and
led to a controversy actively carried on by both parties. The
initiator explicitly or implicitly introduced the issue of the
negotiation or generated the controversial issue by an action
which intentionally interfered with the interests of others.
The replying child expressed his or her position either explic-
itly or implicitly, the latter often by ignoring. When the ad-
dressed child followed the demands of the initiator without any
resistance the interaction was not categorized as a negotia-
tion. For the purpose of the analyses presented here we omitted
those interactions which were recorded by general descriptions
only as for instance "the children arranged a meeting in the
afternoon", since the individual behaviors of the negotiators
were not circumscribed. For the same reason negotiations were
excluded from the subfile if the field notes do not indicate
the initiator of a negotiation. Thus, we base our analyses on
355 completely depicted negotiation sequences, 164 negotiations
among 34 children of the classroom on grade 4, and 191 negotia-
tion sequences of the same quality of description among 31
children of the same classroom on grade 6. Thirty-four percent
of these negotiations took place among boys, 30 percent among
girls, and 36 percent were negotiations with participants from
both genders.

3. Variables and measures

The following variables were defined and used in order to cate-
gorize the qualities of the observed negotiations:

Variables related to the participating children: Besides age
and gender of the participating children it was coded for every

negotiation who initiated the negotiation and who firstly re-
acted to the introductory step. With regard to social relation-
ships between children the friendship status was identified by
categorizing children's dyads as "best friends", "friends", and
"nonfriends" based on the friendship interviews. A modified
version of a previously described coding procedure was used
(H. Oswald/L. Krappmann 1984; Chr. Fricke et al. 1987). The
reliability of the friendship assessment was controlled for the
assig.ment cf the grade 4 children to the relationship catego-
ries and turned out to be satisfactory (interrater agreement:
93 percent; kappa =.88).

Insert table 1 here

Variables related to the domain of the negotiations: Objectives
of the negotiations were distinguished according to the frame
giving meaning to the negotiated issues. We use the concept of
a frame in order to indicate that the objective of a negotia-
tion (like every object of human action and thinking) is so-
cially marked (E. Goffman 1974). With regard to negotiations it
is important to specify into which commonly accepted norms and
regulations the objective is embedded.

The objectives of the observed negotiations have been assigned
to the four frames "severely normative", "moderately conven-
tional", "unrestricted", and "playful and experimental" (cf.
table 1).

- "Severely normative" was adopted as frame in all negotiations
  in which personal rights, bodily entirety, rules of the
  school, orders of authorities were alluded. Attempts to
  bother and their rejection were included in this category.

- Objectives were regarded as "moderately conventional" when a
  regulation was touched upon which does not prescribe rights
  and duties in a strict way as for instance in the case of

requested help. Children, especially friends, accept as a rule that they should help each other. However, it is an objective of free negotiation whether they really help and which kind of help they offer. Besides negotiations about helping cooperative search for a solution to a task given by the teacher and disputes about children's own rules (like not to "tell tales" or not to brag) were assigned to this category.

- The frame of the objective was considered as "unrestricted" if the settlement of a problem was not restrained by general regulations and, therefore, can be developped by the negotiators in their own way. Objectives belonging to this category, for instance, are discussions about opinions, requests for a sip from the other's Coke, or the proposal of a game.

- Negotiations which are elements of a game, the joint invention of a joyous play, or fooling around were categorized as "playful and experimental". In play and fooling around often behaviors are allowed which at other times are forbidden and vice versa, and it is part of the pleasure to convert normal routines into risky and unconventional behaviors.

The first two categories, "severely normative" and "moderately conventional", refer to a more general regulation to be taken into account while the other two coincide in allowing to establish own terms of negotiation. In some respects the "moderately conventional" frame resembles with the "unrestricted" frame since, in contrast to objectives determined by severe norms, here it is less fixed what ought to happen. In 82 percent of the observed negotiations the initiator and the addressed child referred to the same frame adhering to the objective of their negotiation. In 18 percent of the negotiations the replying child changed the definition of the situation by the use of a different frame.

A peculiar frame is introduced to a negotiation if the first step of the initiator includes the "breaking of a norm". He takes away property, he prevents another child from doing his tasks, or he insults a child. It is obvious that "norm breaking" is closely related to the frame ascribed to an objective of a negotiation because objectives which are normatively or conventionally framed lead into problems which the negotiator may try to solve by breaking a norm. However, almost half the negotiations in the domains framed by norms or conventions began without breaking a norm, and about 10 percent of the negotiations in the two domains of children's free agreements were initiated by breaking a norm. Therefore, it was regarded worthwhile to construct a variable "norm breaking in the first step" vs. "norm breaking not in the first step" in order to investigate the relations of norm breaking to other aspects of the negotiation.

The examination of the reliability accomplished in coding the frame of the objectives under negotiation yielded a satisfactory result for a selected part of the material from both age groups (interrater agreement: 85 percent; kappa = .80).

Variables related to the strategies applied by the negotiating children: The overall quality of the opening strategy of the initiator and of the replication strategy of the addressed child was appointed to three patterns (cf. table 1):

- Pattern 1 "Coercion and manipulation" comprises a variety of behaviors by which the other is treated as an obstacle to the fulfilment of one's goals which has to be brushed aside without respect for the other's wishes or legitimate rights. Also the replying child's reaction was assigned to this category if it submitted himself or herself to the initiator's coercive behavior without stating own expectations or appealing to rights.

- Pattern 2 "Offer and reply" refers to all behaviors considering the other as an opposite with own intentions which he or she should give up in order to adjust himself or herself to the initiator's or to the opponent's intentions. Reasons for demand or rejection are not explained whether the rationale is seen to be evident or not worthwhile to be explicated to the partner.

- Pattern 3 "Reasoning" includes all behaviors by which the initiator or the replying child attempts to give reasons to the other in order that he or she can understand the intentions pursued by the respective negotiator. These behaviors appeal to mutual responsibility for an acceptable solution.

A second strategy variable refers to the characteristic combinations of the opening strategies of the initiator and the addressed child's reaction. Four categories were constructed:

- Both negotiators apply strategies of the patterns 2 and 3.

- The initiator selects a strategy of pattern 1; the replying child answers by a strategy categorized in pattern 2 or 3 demanding respect for his or her intentions or rights.

- The initiator begins by a strategy of pattern 2 or 3; the addressed child chooses a strategy of pattern 1 indicating he or she is not willing to consider the other as a person with whom such a topic could be negotiated.

- Both negotiators try to urge the other in the desired direction by using a strategy of pattern 1.

The variable "combination of strategy patterns" contains the effects of the strategy decisions taken by both negotiators and turned out to possess more explanatory power than the single strategy pattern variables. Therefore, in some of the analyses we concentrated on the "combination of strategy patterns".

The reliability of the coding conducted for the strategy pattern variable was examined for a sufficient portion of the negotiations and proved to be satisfactory with regard to the qualitative nature of the observational data. The interrater agreement on the strategy of the initiator was 90 percent (kappa = .73), on the strategy of the addressed child 77 percent (kappa = .59).

Variables related to the outcomes of the negotiation: The "results" achieved by the negotiators have been distinguished as "solution accepted by both sides" and "unaccepted or no solution" (cf. table 1). The first category comprises solutions which are supported or accepted by both parties, the second includes terminations by an unacceptable step of one of the negotiators against the will of the other or endings without any result achieved by the children.

A second categorization of the outcomes of the negotiations refers to the question whether participants were physically or psychically hurt or humiliated in the process of the negotiation or by the solution. The variable "derogation" contains the categories "at least one participant hurt" and "nobody hurt".

Coding instructions for all variables were spelt out in manuals. All coding was executed by at least two trained coders. Their agreement was tested for a sufficient part of the observations by means of Cohen's unweighted Kappa (J. Asendorpf/ H. G. Wallbott 1979). All cases without agreement were discussed until a congruous categorization was accomplished.

4. Results

4.1 General characterization of the negotiations (cf. table 1)

Domain: Although the observations were conducted in the context
of school and teachers' instruction, only about one quarter of
the negotiations were influenced by a severe norm or an author-
itative demand in the first step of the initiator and in one
third of the reactions of the addressed child. About 15 percent
of the negotiations were framed in a less restrictive way by a
convention. More than half of the negotiations were framed in
an unrestricted and playful way by the initiator and/or reply-
ing child and could be carried out according to the conceptions
and intentions of the children. Breaking of norms occurred in a
relatively small portion of the negotiations (only 27 %), most-
ly in the field of cross-gender interactions.

The differences of the frames applied by boys and girls in
same-gender negotiations are of no importance (cf. table 7 in
the annex). But in cross-gender negotiations children more
often referred to severe norms and more often broke norms,
mostly committed by a minority of rambling boys on grade 4.
These differences are small to medium (r = .17 for the frame of
the initiator; r = .32 for norm breaking, p <.001 in both
cases). There is a tendency that children on grade 4 more often
referred to a normative frame and more often broke norms than
the children on grade 6 (r = .21, r = .30, p <.001 in both
cases). These differences between the two age groups diminish
when same-gender negotiations are compared (r = .13, p <.05;
r = .20, p <.01).

Strategy: Strategies of pattern 1 "coercion and manipulation",
by which the other is treated as an obstacle without respect
for his or her demands or rights were applied in almost one
third of the initiations and in almost half of the responses of
the addressed child. In 54 percent of all negotiations a coer-
cive, disrespectful strategy was applied at least from one of

the participants. Strategies of pattern 2 "offer and reply" by which the other is regarded as an opponent who is asked to adjust himsef or herself to own intentions, were applied most frequently in the first step (67 %) and were nearly as frequent as strategies of pattern 1 in the replication (43 %). "Reasoning" strategies occurred astonishingly seldom in the negotiations of children from both age groups observed in natural settings. Only in 12 percent of all negotiations either the initiator or the addressed child used a pattern 3 strategy. Only two out of all 355 observed negotiations were begun by a strategy of pattern 3 from both sides. 43 percent of the initiations in which strategies of pattern 2 or 3 were used, were replied by a strategy of pattern 1 expressing that the initiator or his/her intentions were not respected and worth for a considerate reply.

As in the case of the domain variables the differences in the strategy pattern applied by boys and girls in same-gender negotiations are neglectable (cf. table 7 in the annex). However, in cross-gender negotiations, children used more strategies of pattern 1. This difference is small, too, and due to the three mentioned rambling boys on grade 4 only who started their negotiations with girls by strategies of pattern 1 and provoked replications by the addressed girls applying strategies of pattern 1 as well. Yet the advancements of these boys often were replicated from the side of girls by means of a strategy of pattern 1 even if the boys approached the girls decently using a strategy of pattern 2. On grade 6 the children used more strategies of pattern 2 "offer and reply" than the fourth-graders, but these age differences vanish when we consider same-gender negotiations only.

Outcome: Solutions which were supported or accepted by both parties were achieved only in about half of the negotiations. All other negotiations were either terminated by one child forcing the other without consent, by a confrontation or remained without a result. It is a characteristic feature of the

observed negotiations that in the progress or by the solution of 45 percent of the negotiations the feelings or self images of one or both participants were physically or psychically hurt even if finally an accepted solution was worked out.

A small gender difference emerges in same-gender negotiations since girls more often found a solution which both participants supported or accepted (r = .17, p <.01), but there is no difference with respect to derogation (cf. table 7 in the annex). Slightly more derogations occurred in cross-gender negotiations (r = .20, p <.001), mostly initiated by the rambling boys. But, interestingly enough, boys and girls are hurt nearly to the same extent. The sixthgraders more often found an acceptable solution and avoided derogations than the children on grade 4 (r = .24, r = .26; p <.001 in both cases). These age differences become smaller when we look to same-gender negotiations only.

Friendship: Since children are friends with some of their classmates only we have to expect that they are negotiating not exclusively among friends. Actually, only 18 percent of all observed negotiations took place between best friends, additional 23 percent between friends, and 59 percent between children who are not friends. According to our data girls were negotiating with friends to a greater extent than boys. Seventy percent of the same-gender negotiations of girls occurred between best friends or friends as compared with 41 percent of the same-gender negotiations of boys (r = .29, p <.001). The proportion of negotiations with best friends increased with age for both genders.

Insert table 2 here

4.2 Domain, strategy patterns, and outcomes of the negotiations

The domain of the negotiations proves to be related to the selection of strategies from different patterns and to the outcomes of the negotiations. Even higher correlations emerge between strategy patterns and outcome variables.

Domain and strategy pattern (cf. table 2): The frame attributed to the objective under negotiation by the initiator is associated with the pattern of the initiator's opening strategy ($r = .46$; $p < .001$) and with the pattern of the strategy by which the addressed child reacts to the initiation ($r = .39$; $p < .001$). These correlations are due to the fact that objectives framed as "severely normative" were frequently introduced by means of a strategy of the pattern 1 "coercion and manipulation" while objectives framed as "unrestricted", or "playful and experimental" in more than three quarters of the respective negotiations led to the use of a strategy of pattern 2 or 3 "offer and reply" or "reasoning". This description applies to the correlation between the frame attributed to the objective by the initiator and the strategy pattern of the replying child, too, except for the objectives framed as "moderately conventional" since more than half of the requests for help allotted to this category were articulated by a strategy of pattern 2, but rejected by use of a strategy of pattern 1 (L. Krappmann/H. Oswald 1986; 1987). Likewise the frame adopted by the addressed child is connected with the strategy pattern the child chooses in order to reply ($r = .48$; $p < .001$).

The breaking of a norm by the initiator in the opening of a negotiation is clearly related to the selection of a strategy by the initiator ($r = .53$; $p < .001$) and by the reacting child ($r = .36$; $p < .001$). Norm breaking behavior overwhelmingly was committed and rejected by applying strategies of the pattern 1 "coercion and manipulation".

These correlations between domain and strategies variables ap-
plied by the children appear even clearer if we look to the
connections between the framing of the objective of the nego-
tiation by the initiator or the replying child and the differ-
ent combinations of strategies patterns (cf. table 2 last row).

The correlation of the domain variables with the combination of
pattern variable was controlled for age, gender in same-gender
negotiations, and for same-gender vs. cross-gender negotia-
tions. The coefficients turned out to be significant in all
subgroups. However, the relations are highest in cross-gender
negotiations (up to .74, p <.001) and lowest in same-gender
negotiations of girls (down to .27 p <.01). This result re-
flects the firm connection between the adoption of a normative
frame or the breaking of a norm by the initiating boy in the
cross-gender negotiations, the selection of a strategy of pat-
tern 1 by the boy, and the immediate and often harsh rejection
of the attacked girl. In contrast, there was much more variety
in combining frames and strategy patterns in same-gender nego-
tiations, especially in girl-girl negotiations, where the adop-
tion of a normative frame was not combined with the selection
of a strategy of pattern 1 in the same extent.

Insert table 3 here

Domain and outcomes (cf. Table 3): There exist clear correla-
tions between domain variables and the outcomes of the negotia-
tions which emerge from the connection of the "result" with the
frame attributed by the initiator (r = .30; p <.001), with the
frame attributed by the replying child (r = .36; p <.001), and
with the breaking of a norm in the initiator's first step
(r = .34; p <.001). The correlations between the framing of
both the initiator and the replying child and the breaking of a
norm on the one hand and the "derogation" of a participant on
the other are even higher (r = .48, .52, .51; p <.001). These
correlations result from the fact that in less restricted do-

mains of negotiation more often an acceptable solution was
achieved and more seldom a participant was hurt. The observa-
tions also demonstrate that the breaking of a norm very fre-
quently was followed by unacceptable termination and by the
derogation of one negotiator or both.

The correlations between domain variables and the variable
"result" was controlled for age, sex in same-gender negotia-
tions, and for same-gender vs. cross-gender negotiations. The
correlation coefficients are highest for cross-gender negotia-
tions, small for negotiations on grade 6, and insignificant for
girl-girl negotiations. These figures indicate that sixth-
graders and girls were better able to come to an acceptable
solution than fourthgraders or boys if the objective was framed
as "severely normative" or a norm was broken at the onset of a
negotiation.

Strategy patterns and outcomes: The correlations between strat-
egy and outcome variables are higher than those between domain
and outcome variables (cf. table 3). They reach notable magni-
tude for the connections of the variable "combination of strat-
egy patterns" with the variables "result" and "derogation"
(r = .54 and r = .64; p <.001).

_____

Insert table 4 here

_____

Table 4 shows that an accepted solution was worked out in 85
percent of the negotiations opened from both sides by a strat-
egy of pattern 2 or 3 and that in the same case nobody was hurt
in 92 percent of the negotiations while the combination of
strategies selected from pattern 1 produced the opposite out-
comes in the overwhelming majority of these negotiations.

Again these relations are highest for cross-gender negotiations
(r = .61 and .71; p <.001). They are also high and very similar
for boys and girls in same-sex negotiations (r = .48 to .60;

p <.001) and for the negotiations in both age groups (r = .49 to .68; p <.001).

4.3 Negotiations and friendship

In order to examine the assumption that social relationships influence the behavior we firstly analyze the association of friendship status with the eight negotiation variables. Second-ly, we examine, whether friendship as a controlling variable changes the correlations between domain, strategy, and outcome variables reported above.

Insert table 5 here

Friendship and negotiation variables: Friendship and the nego-tiation variables are moderately related only. The correlations become significant solely for boy-boy negotiations. Since there exist no best friend relationships over the border between the genders in our sample of ten to twelve year old children (H. Oswald et al. 1987) we analyze the influence of friendship in same-gender negotiations only (cf. table 5).

The analyses reveal that there is a tendency that nonfriends more often broke norms, more often used strategies of pattern 1 "coercion and manipulation", and less frequently applied pat-terns and combinations of patterns which are associated with more satisfying results according to our reported analysis. Over two thirds of the negotiations between best friends and friends led to an accepted solution as compared to one third of accepted solutions in the negotiations among nonfriends (p <.001 for best friends and friends vs. nonfriends). And only less than a quarter of the negotiations among best friends and friends are hurtful as compared to nearly half of the negotia-tions among nonfriends (p <.01 for best friends and friends vs. nonfriends).

These results show, that in boys' same-gender negotiations the
statistical risk of getting hurt and missing a solution is much
higher among nonfriends than among friends. However, the cor-
relation coefficients presented in table 5 are not too impres-
sive, and no significant statistical associations become visi-
ble for girls.

Insert table 6 here

Friendship as a controlling variable for the relations between
domain, strategy, and outcome: As shown in table 2 we disclosed
rather strong associations between domain variables and strat-
egies chosen by both initiator and replicator for all negotia-
tions, and this result holds true for girls and boys and for
both grades. This association evanesces, however, for best
friends (cf. table 6) indicating that best friends are not
dependent in the same manner as nonfriends on the usual asso-
ciations between domain and strategy variables.

A similar pattern emerged with regard to the relation of the
domain and the result achieved in the negotiations. Again, best
friends were less determined by the usual association, but were
able to find solutions even if the beginning of a negotiation
was framed as "severely normative". The correlation between the
combination of strategy patterns and the result of negotiations
is not modified in the same extent by the friendship status.
However, the differences of the correlations obtained for best
friends, friends and nonfriends are clearly distinct and alto-
gether point in the same direction (cf. table 6). The coeffi-
cients for the associations between domain and strategy vari-
ables on the one hand and the derogation variable on the other
are high for nonfriends, but only medium for best friends.

5. Discussion

The results of our analyses of children's negotiations in nat-
ural settings admonish the researchers who are looking for de-
velopmental incentives in the social world of childhood, not to
portray children's interactions in a romantic manner. Indeed,
our field notes contain many friendly episodes among children
sharing toys, giving assistance, or cheering up each other. A
lot of the observed negotiations also were of an unproblematic
character. However, there is no denying the fact that in many
interactions children proceeded in a very inconsiderate and
violent way. It is true that many children applying these
unkind and unreflecting behaviors often fail to realize their
intentions. But quite a few children surrender to the fierce
trouble-makers or pay back in the same coin. Thus, we observed
many negotiations which seemed to be immature and without any
stimulation for the promotion of competencies. Sometimes it
appeared absolutely unbelievable that the "interiorisation" of
the observed behavioral patterns could contribute to the gen-
eration of psychological structures establishing the capacities
to solve multifaceted problems in a considerate manner. Can we
concieve of the social world of children as a place where the
children do get more than a rough kind of "education for life"
(H. S. Sullivan 1953)?

Further qualitative examinations of the observed negotiations
are teaching us that many of the harsh and pungent initiations
and replications are well understandable. There were several
objectives which really do not deserve of a more elaborate
presentation than by a strategy of pattern 2 "offer and reply".
There were requests and proposals which correctly are inter-
preted as mere imputations and, therefore, comprehensibly were
responded by a strategy of pattern 1 "coercion and manipula-
tion" excluding the other from an interaction of which he is
not prepared to keep the rules. And there were children occu-
pied with self-oriented motives who treated their classmates as
means or obstacles in the pursuit of their intentions. One way

to get rid of this kind of treatment are resolute strategies of
pattern 1 by which the intruder is pushed back.

But even if the character of many of these asymmetric and dis-
respectful interaction sequences is well understandable by its
nature, we have to admit that a majority of the negotiations
does not seem to offer challenges inviting the negotiators to
take the perspective of the other, to analyse a controversial
issue from different sides, to explain reasons, to protect
feelings and self-images, and to develop mutual responsibility.
Anyhow, there were instances among the observed negotiation in
which children demonstrated these behaviors in greater extent.
Which conditions nourish the performances of more elaborate
negotiations and of more satisfying solutions which better
integrate the intentions of both children and respect their
feeling with more care?

Our results suggest that negotiations among best friends follow
another set of rules than negotiations among less friendly re-
lated children. They "deviate" from the overall tendencies
which reflect that normatively framed objectives and coercive
and manipulatory strategies in the beginning of a negotiation
predominantly push the negotiators to an unacceptable termina-
tion of the negotiation and often cause humiliation. Most of
the respective correlations which are firm for nonfriends,
faint away when the negotiators are best friends. Best friends
more often chose strategies of pattern 2 and more often found
an acceptable solution than nonfriends, even if the frame of
the objective was "severely normative" or if the initiator
broke a norm. It is true that also best friends derogated if
the frame was normative, if the initiator broke a norm or if
one or both parties used strategies of the pattern "coercion
and manipulation". However, best friends avoided such to a much
greater extent. We conclude that best friends try to make the
best out of a problematic beginning even under conditions which
induce nonfriends to deal with the issue in an insensitive and
inconsiderate way.

The reported analyses have demonstrated, however, that being best friends influences the negotiations in the described way in boys' same-gender negotiations only. It is among boys, that friends were more respectful for the intentions of others, more often reached an acceptable solution, and more often avoided derogations than nonfriends. Girls, differently than boys, treated their female nonfriends in the same manner as friends. How can we explain this astonishing dissimilarity?

In general, the differences between the negotiating behaviors of boys and girls were small. In same-gender negotiations boys tended to use a strategy of the pattern 1 "coercion and manipulation" slightly more often than girls, and girls tended to find an acceptable solution somewhat more often than boys. This is due to the girls' capability to achieve an acceptable solution in girl-girl negotiations even though the objective is framed as "severely normative". This means that girls of these age groups produced behaviors in all same-gender negotiations which boys demonstrated in negotiations among best friends only.

We suppose that this difference is a consequence of the fact that among girls the objectives of negotiations more often originated from the context of school, among boys more often from the children's social world. In comparison to the free options prevalent in the children's social world, the context of school favors that negotiators proceed in a more considerate way and overcome forceful actions and reactions. Actually, girls did select more strategies from pattern 2 and 3 and did find more acceptable solutions to normative objectives originating in the context of school than boys. May be, school is more important to girls than to boys and, therefore, obscures the effects of friendship. For the school-oriented girls, the way leading out of the pitfalls of negotiations has already been paved by the school's expectations before girls' friendships can exert their moderating effects.

The reported results give hints at another story contained in our observations: the special character of cross-gender negotiations. A lot of cross-gender negotiations were very similar to same-gender negotiations with respect to the correlations disclosed by our analyses. But a couple of rambling and bullying boys on grade 4 very often started cross-gender interactions by bothering and consequently very often got a reply by ignoring or sanctioning. Thus, the frame of these negotiations more often was "severely normative", more often norms were broken, more often the strategies applied by both boys and girls disregarded the intentions of the other side, and more often the result was a harsh termination and hurting. In the progress of these negotiations boys were derogated as often as girls. These behaviors disappeared on grade 6. We have to admit that these unkind cross-gender negotiations are part of the children's life in classrooms. But they are a small part only, and they are replaced by some kind of beginning flirtations in the older age group.

Since three rambling boys left the classroom before the follow-up on grade 6, the negotiations among the older children lost some vivid aspects. On grade 4, these boys very often were negotiating objectives near to the border between bothering and joke, creative nonsense and norm breaking. Their exit fundamentally changed the quality of social life in the classroom because these boys did not only directly influence the negotiations in which they participated, but we suppose that they were responsible for objectives, strategies, and outcomes in an indirect way, too. Therefore, we gave up the plan to control for age by comparing the behaviors of those children only who belonged to the classroom at both periods of data collection.

Anyhow, as reported above, there exist some age effects which indicate that the children on grade 6 less frequently referred to a normative frame of the objective, broke norms, applied strategies of pattern 1 "coercion and manipulation" and more

often achieved accepted solutions and avoided derogations than
children on grade 4. Although these age differences are influ-
enced by the range of behaviors elicited by the rambling boys
on grade 4, we understand the observed tendencies as an indica-
tion that the children of the older age group make more use of
their competencies to change perspectives, to reflect their
proceedings, and to give reasons for their behaviors.

But obviously the children's negotiation behaviors in natural
settings are not only dependent on their sociocognitive compe-
tencies. The domain of the negotiations exerts a strong influ-
ence because the decision taken on the frame of the objective
guides the selection of the strategy and opens or closes ways
to solutions. Also the selection of strategies in itself con-
tributes to an accepted solution and to the avoidance of der-
ogation. Since domains and strategies seem to be shaped by
contexts, a way becomes apparent how children's behavior is
influenced by their integration into everyday social processes.

At least for boys, the analyses support the assumption that
friendship is such a context. It has to be the task of future
research to look for domains of negotiations in which the in-
fluence of friendship on behaviors might become visible for
girls, too. Why do friends, at least among boys, negotiate in
another way than nonfriends? Intentions, behavioral decisions,
and efforts are not only determined by the actual interaction,
but they are embedded into enduring meaning systems. One of
these enduring meaning systems is friendship (and another is
incorporated in the school). Friendship is supposed to influ-
ence negotiators because they share preferences and knowledge.
But it may be even more essential that friendship generates a
long-termed frame of references which urges to reflect the
actual negotiation under several perspectives. What will my
friend think of me when I am behaving this way? How will this
negotiation influence our lasting relationship? Can the outcome
of today be compensated for in the long run? It is no contra-
diction that we observed negotiations also among friends in

which no reflection, reasoning, or considerateness came in sight. Friendship makes possible to use even unfavorable occurrences for development because the more or less satisfactorily settled negotiation remains part of ongoing joint experiences. In a sense an inadequately solved negotiation can be revised again and again in order to step by stepadjust the behaviors to the standards inherent in friendships.

So far, the analyses do not allow to decide whether domain and friendship influence negotiation behaviors or whether successful and sensitive negotiation behaviors lead to a different selection of objectives and contributes to the establishment of friendships. Both conceptions make sense and we should be prepared that both directions of influence are effective in the social world of children.

References

Asendorpf, J., and Wallbott, H.G.: Maße der Beobachtungsüber-
einstimmung: Ein systematischer Vergleich. In: Zeitschrift
für Sozialpsychologie 10 (1979), pp.243-252

Berkowitz, M.W., and Gibbs, J.C.: Measuring the developmental
features of moral discussion. In: Merrill-Palmer-Quarterly
29 (1983), pp. 399-410

Berkowitz, M.W., Oser, F., and Althof, W.: The development of
sociomoral discourse. In: W. Kurtines and J. Gerwitz
(Eds.): Social interaction and sociomoral development (in
press)

Berndt, T.J.: The influence of group discussions on children's
moral decisions. In: J.C. Masters and K. Yarkin-Levin
(Eds.): Boundary areas in social and developmental psy-
chology. New York: Academic Press 1984, pp. 195-219

Damon, W., and Killen, M.: Peer interaction and the process of
change in children's moral reasoning. In: Merrill-Palmer-
Quarterly 28(1982), pp. 347-367

Dodge, K.A.: Behavioral antecedents of peer social status. In:
Child development 54 (1983), pp. 1386-1399

Doise, W.: Social regulations in cognitive development. In:
R.A. Hinde, A.-N. Perret-Clermont, and J. Stevenson-Hinde
(Eds.): Social relationships and cognitive development.
Oxford: Clarendon Press 1985, pp. 294-308

Fricke, Chr., Oswald, H., and Krappmann, L.: Intensität von
dyadischen Kinderbeziehungen in Schulklassen (Coding
manual. Version 1987.1). Unpubl. ms. available from the
Max-Planck-Institute of Human Development and Education.
Berlin, FRG

Glachan, M., and Light, P.: Peer interaction and learning: Can
two wrongs make a right? In: G.Butterworth and P.Light
(Eds.): Social cognition. Chicago: University of Chicago
Press 1982, pp. 238-262

Glaser, B.G., and Strauss, A.L.: The discovery of grounded
theory. Chicago: Aldine 1967

Goffman, E., Frame analysis. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univer-
sity Press 1974

Keller, M., and Reuss, S.: The process of moral-decision mak-
ing: Normative and empirical conditions of participation
in moral discourse. In: M.W. Berkowitz and F. Oser (Eds.):
Moral education: Theory and application. Hillsdale, NJ:
Lawrence Erlbaum 1985, pp. 109-123

Krappmann, L., and Oswald, H.: "Prosocial" and "antisocial"
    helping among ten-year old children - Results from a
    qualitative study in natural settings. Paper presented at
    the II. European Conference on Developmental Psychology,
    Rome, Italy, 1986

Krappmann, L., and Oswald, H.: Probleme des Helfens unter
    Kindern. In: L. Montada and H. W. Bierhoff: Altruismus -
    Bedingungen der Hilfsbereitschaft. Göttingen: Hogrefe 1987
    (in press).

Kurdek, L.A., and Lillie, R.: The relation between classroom
    social status and classmate likability, compromising
    skill, temperament, and neighborhood social interactions.
    In: Journal of applied developmental psychology 6 (1985),
    pp. 31-41

Miller, M.: Zur Ontogenese des koordinierten Dissens. In:
    W.Edelstein and J.Habermas (Eds.): Soziale Interaktion und
    soziales Verstehen. Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp 1984, pp.
    220-250

Mugny, G., De Paolis, P., and Carugati, F.: Social regulations
    in cognitive development. In: W. Doise and A. Palmonari
    (Eds.): Social interaction in individual development.
    Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1984, pp. 127-146

Nelson, J., and Aboud, F.E.: The resolution of social conflicts
    between friends. In: Child development 56 (1985), pp.
    1009-1017

Oser, F.: Moralisches Urteil in Gruppen. Frankfurt/Main: Suhr-
    kamp 1981

Oswald, H., and Krappmann, L.: Konstanz und Veränderung in den
    sozialen Beziehungen von Schulkindern. In: Zeitschrift für
    Sozialisationsforschung und Erziehungssoziologie 4 (1984)
    pp. 271-286

Oswald, H., Krappmann, L., von Salisch, M., and Chowdhuri, I.:
    Gaps and bridges - Interactions between boys and girls in
    an elementary school. In: Sociological studies in child
    development, Vol. II, ed. by P.Adler and P.Adler. Green-
    wich 1987 (in press)

Piaget, J.: Le langage et la pensee chez l'enfant. Neuchatel:
    Delachauz & Niestle 1923

Powers, S.I.: Family interaction and parental moral development
    as a context for adolescent moral development. Unpubl.
    doct. diss., Harvard University 1982

Renshaw, P.D., and Asher, S.T.: Children's goals and strategies for social interaction. In: Merrill-Palmer-Quarterly 29 (1983), pp. 353-374

Selman, R.L.: The growth of interpersonal understanding. New York: Academic Press 1980

Selman, R.L., and Demorest, A.P.: Observing troubled children's interpersonal negotiation strategies: Implications of and for a developmental model. In: Cild development 55 (1984), pp. 288-304

Shantz, C.U., and Shantz, D.W.: Conflict between children: Social-cognitive and sociometric correlates. In: New directions for child development No. 29 (1985), pp. 3-21

Smollar-Volpe, J., and Youniss, J.: Social development through friendship. In: K.H.Rubin and H.S.Ross (Eds.): Peer relationships and social skills in childhood. New York: Springer, 1982, pp. 279-298

Süß, K.U.: Qualitas. A software package for the analysis of qualitative data. Fachbereich Erziehungs- und Unterrichtswissenschaften. Freie Universität Berlin. Unpubl. Ms. 1987

Sullivan, H.S.: The interpersonal theory of psychiatry. New York: Norton 1953

Youniss, J.: Parents and peers in social development: A Sullivan-Piaget perspective. Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1980

Table 1: Variables Related to Negotiations

I.   Domain Variables

	1. Step N	1. Step %	2. Step N	2. Step %
1. Frame of Objective				
(1) severely normative	93	26	116	33
(2) moderately conventional	57	16	52	15
(3) unrestricted	113	32	101	29
(4) playful, experimental	92	26	86	24
	355	100	355	101
2. Norm Breaking				
(1) in the first step	96	27		
(2) not in the first step	259	73		
	355	100		

II. Strategy Variables

	1. Step N	1. Step %	2. Step N	2. Step %
3. Strategy Patterns				
(1) coercion and manipulation	104	30	104	48
(2) offer and reply	236	67	152	43
(3) reasoning[1]	13	4	33	9
	353	101	353	100

4. Combination of Strategy Patterns	N	%
(1) initiation: pattern (2) or (3) replication: pattern (2) or (3)	130	37
(2) initiation: pattern (1) replication: pattern (2) or (3)	21	6
(3) initiation: pattern (2) or (3) replication: pattern (1)	106	30
(4) initiation: pattern (1) replication: pattern (1)	95	27
	352	100

---

1 In all later calculations strategy pattern (2) and (3) are combined.

Table 1 continued

III. Outcome Variables	N	%
5. Result		
(1) accepted solution	184	52
(2) unaccepted or no solution	171	48
	355	100
6. Derogation		
(1) at least one participant hurt	160	45
(2) nobody hurt	193	55
	353	100

32

Table 2: Correlations (Pearson's R) of Domain Variables with Strategy Variables

	Domain Variables		
	frame	frame	norm breaking
Strategy Variables	1. step	2. step	1. step
pattern 1. step	.46	.37	.53
pattern 2. step	.39	.48	.36
combinations of patterns	.48	.52	.49

Table 3: Correlations (Pearson's R) of Domain and Strategy Variables with Outcome Variables

	Domain Variables			Strategy Variables		
	frame	frame	norm breaking	pattern	pattern	combination of patterns
Outcome Variables	1.step	2.step	1.step	1.step	2.step	
result	.30	.36	.34	.39	.49	.54
derogation	.48	.52	.51	.50	.57	.64

All correlations in table 2 and 3 are significant with p <.001.

Table 4: Combination of Strategy Patterns by Result and Derogation (in Percent)

Outcome Variables		Combination of Strategy Patterns			
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
result					
accepted by both		85	52	43	18
unaccepted or no solution		15	48	58	82
	%	100	100	101	100
	N	130	21	106	95
derogation					
participant hurt		8	43	52	88
nobody hurt		92	57	48	12
	%	100	100	100	100
	N	129	21	105	95

Table 5: Correlations (Pearson's R) of Negotiation Variables with Friendship in Same-Gender Negotiations Controlled for Gender

	Friendship (same-gender)	
Negotiation Variables	boys	girls
Domain Variables		
frame 1. step	n.s.	n.s.
frame 2. step	n.s.	n.s.
norm breaking 1. step	.18*	n.s.
Strategy Variables		
pattern 1. step	.20*	n.s.
pattern 2. step	.19*	n.s.
combination of pattern	.23**	n.s.
Outcome Variables		
result	.25***	n.s.
derogation	.20*	n.s.

*** p <.001
** p <.01
* p <.05
n.s. = not significant

35

Table 6: Correlations (Pearson's R) between Domain, Strategy, and Outcome Variables Controlled by Friendship

| | Domain Variables | | | Strategies: |
| | frame | frame | norm-breaking | Combination of Patterns |
	1.step	2.step	1.step	
Combination of Patterns				
best friends	n.s.	n.s.	.19+	
friends	.49***	.48**	.39**	
no friends	.54***	.59***	.54***	
Result				
best friends	n.s.	n.s.	.22*	.40***
friends	.29**	.26*	n.s.	.53***
no friends	.34***	.43***	.36***	.53***
Derogation				
best friends	.32**	.37***	.37**	.47***
friends	.39***	.42***	.26**	.53***
no friends	.53***	.59***	.56***	.69***

*** p <.001
** p <.01
* p <.05
+ p <.10
n.s. = not significant

36

Tables 7: Correlations of Negotiation Variables with Age (grade 4
vs. grade 6), and Gender (same-gender vs. cross-gender;
boy-boy vs. girl-girl)

Negotiation Variables	grade 4 vs. grade 6	Age and Gender same-gender vs. cross-gender	same-gender boys vs. girls
Domain Variables			
frame 1. step	.21***	.17***	.11*
frame 2. step	.25***	.19***	.09+
norm breaking	.30***	.32***	n.s.
Strategy Variables			
pattern 1. step	.22***	.19***	.12*
pattern 2. step	.19***	.13**	n.s.
combination of patterns	.24***	.18***	n.s.
Outcome Variables			
result	.24***	.12*	.17**
derogation	.26***	.20***	n.s.

*** p < .001
** p < .01
* p < .05
+ p < .10
n.s. = not significant

37